REMARKS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 15, and 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,407,591 to Wong et. al ("Wong").

Claims 27-30 have been allowed. Claims 11-14 stand objected for being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 11-15, 20-23, and 27-30 are now pending, with Claims 1, 4, 9, 11, 20, 22, 27-30 being independent.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections, and requests reconsideration and allowance.

Claim 1

The amended Claim 1 is patentable over Wong at least because Wong does not anticipate at least one feature of Claim 1. For example, Wong fails to anticipate "compensating for delay between the input clock signal and the output clock signal," as recited in Claim 1.

The amendments to Claim 1 do not add new matter (see Fig. 7 and pages 16-18 of the application). The suport for the "delay between the input clock signal and the output clock signal" is shown in the timing diagrams of Figs. 4a and 4b, and discussed on pages 10-12 of the application. Moreover, an exemplary compensation solution is shown in Fig. 7. Wong fails to show such a compensation solution.

In Fig. 7, "A compensator ... compensates for the delay and aligns the electronic device's internal clock with the master clock signal supplied by the clock generator" (p. 17, lines 1-4). Figure 7 shows a phase-lock loop (PLL) 134 and a clock

feedback matching circuit 136 as part of compensator.

Furthermore, "in the case of a single-ended input, CORE CLK signal 132 is in phase with CLK input signal 16." Whereas, "in the case of a differential c(1)ock input, CORE CLK signal 132 is in phase with the zero crossings of the differential clock signal" as shown in Fig. 4b. Hence, not only does Wong not show a compensation solution, but Wong fails to teach or suggest how such a solution would handle a single-ended input and/or a differential clock input.

Since Wong does not anticipate at least one feature of the claim, then the 102(e) rejection to Claim 1 should be withdrawn and that claim should be allowed.

Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8

Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8 depend from Claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 1.

Claim 4

The amended Claim 4 is patentable over Wong at least because Wong does not anticipate at least one feature of that claim. For instance, Wong fails to anticipate the feature of "aligning the input clock signal and the output clock signal, wherein the aligning the input clock signal and the output clock signal comprises compensating for delay of the output clock signal," as recited in Claim 4.

The amendments to Claim 4 do not add new matter (see Fig. 7 and pages 16-18 of the application). The suport for the "aligning the input clock signal and the output clock signal" is shown in the timing diagrams of Figs. 4a and 4b, and discussed

on pages 10-12 of the application. Moreover, an exemplary compensation solution is shown in Fig. 7. Wong fails to show such a compensation solution.

Since Wong does not anticipate at least one feature of the claim, then the 102(e) rejection to Claim 4 should be withdrawn and Claim 4 should be allowed.

Claim 9

The amended Claim 9 is patentable over Wong at least because Wong does not anticipate at least one feature of that claim. For instance, Wong fails to anticipate the feature(s) below: (emphasis added)

a detector coupled to the second terminal to receive the second channel of the clock input signal, wherein the detector is configured to output a clock mode signal as a function of a voltage potential of the second channel of the clock signal, wherein the clock mode signal is coupled to a clock feedback matching circuit in a clock compensator.

The amendments to Claim 9 do not add new matter (see Fig. 7 and pages 16-18 of the application). Fig. 7 shows an exemplary compensation solution "wherein the clock mode signal is coupled to a clock feedback matching circuit in a clock compensator."

In Fig. 7, a compensator 130 and a clock feedback matching circuit 136 are shown. Wong fails to show a compensation solution. Wong also fails to show a clock feedback matching circuit.

Since Wong does not anticipate at least one feature of the claim, then the 102(e) rejection to Claim 9 should be withdrawn and that claim should be allowed.

Claim 10

Claim 10 has been cancelled to obviate the 102(e) rejection and place the remaining claims in condition for allowance.

Claims 11-14

In the Office Action, Claims 11-14 stand objected for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, Claim 10. The Office Action further notes that Claims 11-14 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." To place Claims 11-14 in condition for allowance, the Applicants hereby cancel Claim 10 and amend Claim 11 to include the limitations of the base claim. The Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 11-14.

Claim 15

Claim 15 depends from Claim 14 and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 14.

Claim 20

The amended Claim 20 includes features similar to Claim 1, and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 1.

Claim 21

Claim 21 depends from Claim 20 and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 20.

Claim 22

The amended Claim 22 is patentable over Wong at least because Wong does not anticipate at least one feature of that claim. For instance, Wong fails to anticipate the feature of "coupling the clock mode signal to a clock feedback matching circuit in a clock compensator."

As discussed above in the reasons for allowance of Claim 9, the amendments to Claim 22 do not add new matter. Moreover, this feature is not anticipated in Wong. Therefore, proper allowance of Claim 22 is respectfully requested.

Claim 23

Claim 23 depends from Claim 22 and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 22.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, Applicants believe that Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-15, 20-23, and 27-30 are in condition for allowance and ask that those pending claims be allowed. The foregoing comments made with respect to the positions taken by the Examiner are not to be construed as acquiescence with other positions of the Examiner that have not been explicitly contested. Accordingly, Applicants' arguments for patentability of a claim should not be construed as implying that there are not other valid reasons for patentability of that claim or other claims.

No fee is believed to be due at this time. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

08/19/03

Dwight U. Thompson Reg. No. 53,688

Fish & Richardson P.C.

PTO Customer Number:

20985

4350 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 500

San Diego, CA 92122

Telephone: (858) 678-5070 Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

10321131.doc

FAX RECEIVED

AUG 2 0 2003 GROUP 2800

OFICIAL